

Date: Sun, 5 Sep 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #323
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 5 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 323

Today's Topics:

Codeless Technician (4 msgs)
Noisy ARRL VEC's (3 msgs)
RIF RAFF
Son of PRB-1?
Updating the test

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 93 14:34:16 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <75TB0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
writes:

>If those who choose not to learn Morse already have access to
>Amateur Radio (via the Codeless Technician), why debate?
>As Bobby McFerrin said, "Don't worry, be happy." Of course,
>if you're NOT happy with the current state of things, the
>FCC is still accepting licenses sent in for cancellation.
>

The problem is not having to learn Morris but having to be fluent in
Morris. I would have no problem with having to pass a Morris test at 5
wpm but having to devote the extra time to learn it at 13 wpm is stupid.

My biggest problem is the time wasted to become fluent in Morris.

The OF insist that not only is the knowledge of Morris necessary but that one must also be fluent in an nearly dead form of communication.

Nothing is more old fartish than straight key night they could also add gay key night to balance things out.

73

--
Rod Anderson N0NZO | "I do not think the United States government
Boulder, CO | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | fanatics decided to kill themselves"
satellite N0NZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: Sat, 04 Sep 93 21:11:41 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!torn!nott!cunews!revcan!balsam!
cowan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

> In article <75TB0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
> The problem is not having to learn Morris but having to be fluent in
> Morris. I would have no problem with having to pass a Morris test at 5
> wpm but having to devote the extra time to learn it at 13 wpm is stupid.
>
> My biggest problem is the time wasted to become fluent in Morris.

Actually, it appears your biggest problem is the time wasted to become able to spell Morse <grin>.

--
Darin Cowan - cowan@balsam.pinetree.org | I just try to make people's
VE3 OIJ | lives a little more surreal

Date: Sun, 5 Sep 93 03:19:21 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <7DFD0B1w165w@balsam.pinetree.org> cowan@balsam.pinetree.org (Darin Cowan) writes:

>rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

>

>> In article <75TB0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)

>> The problem is not having to learn Morris but having to be fluent in

>> Morris. I would have no problem with having to pass a Morris test at 5

>> wpm but having to devote the extra time to learn it at 13 wpm is stupid.

>>

>> My biggest problem is the time wasted to become fluent in Morris.

>

>Actually, it appears your biggest problem is the time wasted to become

>able to spell Morse <grin>.

But my spelling checker automatically changes it into Morris.

All of the OF worship the Code of Morris.

--

Rod Anderson	NONZO		"I do not think the United States government
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu			is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
			fanatics decided to kill themselves"
Clinton, Gore, gone in four			Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: Sat, 04 Sep 93 12:44:34 CDT

From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Codeless Technician

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

> The problem is not having to learn Morris but having to be fluent in

> Morris. I would have no problem with having to pass a Morris test at 5

> wpm but having to devote the extra time to learn it at 13 wpm is stupid.

>

> My biggest problem is the time wasted to become fluent in Morris.

>

> The OF insist that not only is the knowledge of Morris necessary but that

> one must also be fluent in an nearly dead form of communication.

Perhaps the problem is that you are learning the WRONG form of code.

Try studying MORSE code and you will do much better at the exam session.

By the way, if this is typical of the intelligence of lower class

licensees, perhaps beefing up the CODE tests would be in order.

Opinions?

--Robert

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 1993 19:36:09 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!pineapp@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Noisy ARRL VEC's
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I would like to know why ARRL VEC's are noisy during the license exams? I have attended two differant sessions located in Cupertino, California, Tandom Computer cafeteria. During these seesion the volenteers are chatting away. It is as those they think this is a coffee house.

The other NON-ARRL VEC's (Sunnyvale , Redwood City, and San Carlo, California) make it a point that there will be no talking from non exams takers.

This is only an observation.

--

```
-----+-----  
| INTERNET: pineapp@netcom.com          | Daniel Curry  WB6STW      |  
| AMPRNET : dan@wb6stw.ampr.org [44.4.20.144] | E-:-) Ham Radio Operator |  
| AX.25   : wb6stw@n0ary.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA   | Redwood City, CA USA    |  
-----+-----
```

Date: 5 Sep 1993 02:59:43 GMT
From: nothing.ucsd.edu!brian@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Noisy ARRL VEC's
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <pineappCCuH49.2pu@netcom.com> pineapp@netcom.com (Dan Curry) writes:
> I would like to know why ARRL VEC's are noisy during the license exams?

Keeps the riff-raff out of the hobby.
- Brian

Date: Sun, 5 Sep 1993 03:16:56 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!portal!ttolh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Noisy ARRL VEC's
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <pineappCCuH49.2pu@netcom.com> pineapp@netcom.com (Dan Curry) writes:

> I would like to know why ARRL VEC's are noisy during the license
>exams? I have attended two differant sessions located in Cupertino,
>California, Tandom Computer cafeteria. During these seesion the
>volenteers are chatting away. It is as those they think this is
>a coffee house.
> The other NON-ARRL VEC's (Sunnyvale , Redwood City, and San Carlo,
>California) make it a point that there will be no talking from non
>exams takers.

Sounds like you have one or more VE teams that are a bit
inconsiderate. I've been a candidate at numerous ARRL VEC-sponsored
exams, and I've served as a VE at many more ARRL-VEC sponsored
sessions. At all of these sessions, the examiners have been careful
to prevent anuy sort of disturbance which would distract the
candidates, most especially during the code tests.

Next time, why don't you ask the noisy examiners to pipe down?

--

Todd Tolhurst, WA1M : Never attribute to malice
Waterbury, CT : that which can be adequately
ttolh@shell.portal.com : explained by stupidity.

Date: Sun, 5 Sep 1993 04:52:06 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!indirect.com!nu7i@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: RIF RAFF
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have an interesting senario for this one.
Suppose that a person is convicted of a felony to which he/she is actually
innocent. The person was a ham and looses their license for this. Later,
after release that person can never be a ham???
Also, what about those who are successfully rehabilitated? You know, it
could happen to any of us! I'm not sure it would even get rid of any
rifraf anyhow. 73

Date: 3 Sep 1993 16:39:27 GMT
From: concert!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!hobbes.cc.uga.edu!aisun3.ai.uga.edu!
mcovingt@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Son of PRB-1?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <MARK.93Sep3103825@era.ERA.COM> mark@ERA.COM (Mark Feit) writes:
>On rec.radio.amateur.policy, mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael Covington)

posts:

> > (I must say, I agree with them, and would also like to see a statute
> > that overturns "voluntary private agreements" [real estate covenants]
> > that ban antennas.)

>

>The above would certainly be nice. I'm no lawyer, but I'd be willing
>to bet there's no way the FCC can invalidate a voluntary agreement.

I don't know if the FCC can. Congress certainly can. There are plenty
of laws that forbid or invalidate various kinds of private agreements.
Indeed, some zoning laws automatically invalidate real estate covenants.
If they didn't, the city would never be able to rezone anything.

>[local cable TV providers unwilling to pay royalties to TV stations
> to carry their signals, and dropping local broadcasts for the reason]

>I wonder how this will effect my antenna-retentive, all-cable
>neighborhood when the stations disappear and the folks who spend their
>time walking around picking nits can't pull in ``Major Dad'' in the
>evenings.

We may suddenly have a bunch of new allies. Locally, I'm going to push
for the county commission to invalidate all anti-antenna covenants if
the local cable provider won't carry local stations.

--

:- Michael A. Covington, Associate Research Scientist		:	*****
:- Artificial Intelligence Programs		mcovingt@ai.uga.edu	: *****
:- The University of Georgia		phone 706 542-0358	: * * *
:- Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A.		amateur radio N4TMI	: ** *** ** <><

Date: Thu, 2 Sep 1993 23:20:10 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Updating the test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2651cjINNoi@abyss.West.Sun.COM> Dana Myers,
myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM writes:
>Now, so Rick doesn't worry, someone tell him about the riff-raff in Rhode
>Island that have been absent for a few weeks (can you say "Rev." ?).

Yea, Now I remember him.....I saw a couple posts, when I first hooked
the feed. He was entertaining....Oh BTW, the shoe doesn't fit....But
if the FCC doesn't hurry up and process the application....It may. 10

weeks and still waiting

Instead of giving politicians the keys to the city, Maybe we should
change the locks!

Rick Aldom ex STS1/SS**The opinions expressed are my

Sub Sailors do it deeper***own and probably aren't yours!

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 1993 17:06:19 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-
state.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.uiowa.edu!icaen.uiowa.edu!

drenze@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.93Aug30215711@urth.eng.sun.com>, <3TP69B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
<1993Sep3.141400.26097@mixcom.mixcom.com>owa.edu

Subject : Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

kevin.jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>I agree 100%. However, MOST of us are NOT in favor of a "free ride".

>We ARE in favor of test that reflects the current state-of-the-art

>in radio communications and is not a fixation on a historic method

>of "modulation" (CW).

In that case, wouldn't a "fairer" version of a practical test be the
ability to scratch-build a dual-band FM HT with all-band coverage? Don't
think I could do it...could you?

>I realize it is an international "law". In time, the amateur radio
>community and the rest of the world will realize that CW is an archaic
>mode of communication that deserves a respected place in history. No
>more and no less. For now, I'm happy to wait it out. It's just a
>matter of time.

I hope not. I'm just getting into ham radio, and, believe it or not, it's
the CW challenge that got me into it. I'd hate to think that some of the
HF bands would eventually be overrun by SSB'ers, packet, and other forms
of communication which would drown out CW. And as for being archaic...just
remember, this "archaic" form of communication can still reliably transmit
information under conditions when every other form of amateur communication
(including packet) would be drowned out by noise. Doesn't sound too
archaic to me.

>I for one, am happy to spend my time above 30 MHz where the projects
>I am working on (900 MHz spread-spectrum, high-speed digital, frequency
>hopping, etc.) would leave the vast majority of the O.F.s completely
>bewildered. At least I won't run into such a closed-minded attitude

>up there!

Glad you enjoy it up there...I plan on joining you as soon as my ticket comes in. But I'll also be enjoying the HF world...is something strange and wond'rous about it.

Peace es 73 de Doug N0Y?? or N0Z??
02W 04D 23H 7M and counting...

```
--
__  /|  | Douglas J Renze          | Charter Member, Popular Front
\ 'o.o' | +1 319 337 4664          | for Revolutionary Darwinism:
=(___)= | drenze@isca.uiowa.edu    |
      U  | Douglas-Renze@uiowa.edu | Evolution Now!
```

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 1993 00:57:14 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug28.182818.1169@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
<RFM.93Sep1093436@urth.eng.sun.com>, <1993Sep2.141148.26692@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Updating the test

In article <1993Sep2.141148.26692@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

>
>The psychological principal about level of difficulty = level of appreciation
>works with some, but others need to have the threat of enforcement and loss
>of privilege held over their heads. There seems to be less and less threat
>of enforcement lately, given the budget cuts within the FCC...

I think this slacking of FCC enforcement is more perception than reality. The FCC never vigorously persued rule violators unless they were extremely blatant and persistent, or offered interference to safety communications. What's happened instead in the last 30 years is a general loss of respect for law in society. There are many causes for this, from the seemingly successful disturbances of the 60s to the widespread contempt for the 55 MPH speed limit and so on. Many people are now less hesitant to disobey their government on a variety of issues than they once were.

Gary

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | "If 10% is good enough | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | for Jesus, it's good  | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
```


534 Shannon Way | enough for Uncle Sam." | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | -Ray Stevens |

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 1993 01:31:09 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CCovnw.9tE@fc.hp.com>, <2633mi\$b4q@csugrad.cs.vt.edu>,
<1993Sep2.203223.3393@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

In article <1993Sep2.203223.3393@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul
Flaherty) writes:

>jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu (Joe Reid) writes:

>

>>Anyone know when the next WARC conf would be?

>

>It's likely that a General WARC will be called within the next 5-10 years,
>given the need to resolve a number of issues, many resulting from the
>breakup of the Eastern Bloc nations. The last General WARC was in 1979, and
>the last Special WARC in 1992.

>

>As I've stated before, it's unlikely that the ITU will drop the CW requirement,
>owing to countries with direct revenue from their PTTs. It might be traded
>for other concessions, though.

Actually, as I understand it, it was only intense lobbying by the US
that kept the Morse requirement below 30 MHz at the *last* WARC. The
boundary was moved from 50 MHz to 30 MHz as part of a face saving compromise.
In the late 20th century, amateur radio is no longer viewed as serious
competition to PTT monopolies. And in many countries PTTs themselves
are becoming privatized or being allowed to face competition from
private commercial providers. Especially with the breakup of the Eastern
Bloc, world telecommunications is likely to see revolutionary changes
in the way it operates over the next few years. Anachronisms like
manual Morse requirements are likely to be swept away in the process.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | "If 10% is good enough | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | for Jesus, it's good | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | enough for Uncle Sam." | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | -Ray Stevens |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #323
